



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,152	12/01/2000	Michael H. Gilbert	F-120	4441
919	7590	06/30/2010	EXAMINER	
PITNEY BOWES INC.			KARMIS, STEFANOS	
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MSC 26-22			3693	
SHELTON, CT 06484-3000				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/30/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

iptl@pb.com



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09728152	12/1/2000	GILBERT, MICHAEL H.	F-120
EXAMINER			
STEFANOS KARMIS			
ART UNIT	PAPER		
3693	20100628		

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

This communication is in response to the Patent Appeal Return Center noting that claims 17 and 18 were not included in the grounds of rejection.

Therefore, a corrected Grounds of Rejection section is listed below and the case will be forwarded back to The Board.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-5 and 8-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savage, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0026394 A1.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-16, the Examiner notes the decision of The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences which issued a decision on the claims on 24 March 2009. In the decision, the Board found claims 1-5 and 8-16 to be unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Savage.

Applicant's amendment of generating by a fourth computer unit the bill based upon the billing information to the customer in the form of electronic data with billing information suitable for printing; and transmitting by a fourth computer unit the bill, to an optimal mailing location for printing and mailing to the customer has already been considered by The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (see Board Decision, mailed 24 March 2009, pages 11-12 and discussion regarding claim 6 and 7). Therefore, the

amendment to the claim 1 is entered and Applicant's argument is not persuasive.

4. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savage, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0026394 A1 in view of Carlin U.S. Patent No. 6,697,843 B1.

Regarding the rejection of claims 6 and 7, the Examiner notes the decision of The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences which issued a decision on the claims on 24 March 2009. In the decision, the Board found claims 6 and 7 to be unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Savage in view of Carlin. Since there are no new amendments to the claims, the rejection stands as stated by the Board.

/Stefanos Karmis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3693